

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

A selective and partially annotated bibliography on transcription in social research

Other

How to cite:

Hammersley, Martyn (2010). A selective and partially annotated bibliography on transcription in social research. Unpublished.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2010 Martyn Hammersley

Version: Version of Record

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

A Selective, Partially Annotated, Bibliography on Transcription

Anderson, J. F. (1998) 'Transcribing with voice recognition software: a new tool for qualitative researchers', *Qualitative Health Research*, 8, 5, pp718-23.

This article outlines the software available (in 1998) for voice recognition that can be used to transcribe oral data. Its use involves listening to the recording and repeating the words (and any additional features) into a microphone. It is suggested that with adequate hardware, and practice, this software can be an effective means of transcribing data, at least as a way of generating an initial transcript of the words used, to be corrected and developed later.

Ashmore, M. and Reed, D. (2000) 'Innocence and nostalgia in conversation analysis: the dynamic relations of tape and transcript', *Forum: Qualitative Research*, 1, 3 (online journal). Available at:

<http://qualitative-research.net/fqs/fqs-eng.htm> [accessed 15.02.08]

This article sets up a contrast between Conversation Analysts' treatment of audio recordings as "realist" object' and transcripts as "constructivist" object'. This is done as a means of interrogating the epistemological and ontological assumptions of CA. The authors describe what they offer as an "insider critique" motivated by deep agreement with the broad aims and substantial achievements of this intellectual movement' (para 1); though this is a claim that should not be taken at face value! Ashmore and Reed focus on the way in which recordings tend to be treated as 'found objects', so that they come to stand in for the events recorded, whereas the constructed character of transcripts is explicitly recognised. This is made sense of via what they refer to as 'the general epistemo-phenomenological schema', which portrays movement over the course of CA inquiry from mythic event through recording and transcript to analysis and article, combined with 'nostalgic' returns in the opposite direction as a means of validation. The general thrust of the article is to emphasise the constitutive role of CA in relation to the phenomena it studies, with the implication that it trades on a mythic realism. This is used to challenge the idea that CA is more rigorous than some other forms of social science because it can supply readers with the data (transcript extracts) that validate the analysis, allowing a form of replication.

Ashmore, M., MacMillan, K., and Brown, S. D. (2004) "It's a Scream": Professional hearing and tape fetishism', *Journal of Pragmatics* 36(2), pp349-374.

Examines the treatment of audio-recording as 'a direct and evidential record of a past event, and thus as a quasi-magical time machine' (tape fetishism) and the role of 'professional hearing' in conversation and discourse analysis. The conclusion, or starting point, is that 'all hearings are mediated' (abstract). In other words, if conversation and discourse analysts were to examine the role of the audio-recording in their work, their claims to be documenting real processes would be undermined, or at least put into

suspension. The case of the role of hearing audio recordings in conversation and discourse analysis is compared with the playing in court of an audio-recording in the case of two therapists who were accused of seeking to defraud health insurers. The authors summarise their interest as ‘the way in which “hearing”, as an activity that is represented, worked-up and publicly performed, enters into epistemic processes’, and in particular how it is portrayed as ‘natural’ rather than ‘constructed’ (p353).

Atkinson, J. M. and Heritage, J. (1984) ‘Transcript notation’, in Atkinson, J. M. and Heritage, J. (eds.) *Structures of Social Action*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

An early published account of Gail Jefferson’s transcription system, which was developed in the context of conversation analysis.

Atkinson, P. (1992) *Understanding Ethnographic Texts*, Thousand Oaks, Sage, Chapter 4.

Outlines some of the issues in representing others’ talk within research writing, not just specifically in relation to the transcription of audio- or video-tapes but in fieldnotes too, particularly the use of standard and non-standard spelling, punctuation etc.

Bailey, Charles-James N. (1986) ‘Even dialectologists get the blues: Inadequate phonetic transcription of English’, *Papere zur Linguistik* 35, 2, pp3-38.

Bailey, Guy, Jan Tillery, & Claire Andres (2005) ‘Some effects of transcribers on data in dialectology’, *American Speech*, 80, 1, pp3-21.

Bird, C. (2005) ‘How I stopped dreading and learned to love transcription’, *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11, 2, pp226-48.

Recounts the author’s experience as a novice researcher reflecting on the significance of transcription within the context of qualitative research methodology. Views transcription as a process of construction, and transcripts as ‘nonobjective’, reflecting the role of the transcriber as a ‘social and political being’. In line with this she poses an ethical question about: ‘how the voices of the research participants can be heard in the way they wish them to be heard’ (p228). Transcription involves selection, and also requires the transcriber to draw on cultural and discursive capacities. The nature of the transcript produced also reflects the transcriber’s/researcher’s methodological stance. The author reviews some of the literature on transcription and outlines the implications from her own data. She provides a narrative of her own developing experience of transcription, noting the tendency to ‘reinvent the wheel’. Ends by highlighting the need for students to be introduced to transcription issues. Her ‘learning to love’ transcription arose from her discovery that transcription machines can greatly aid the process. [The discussion of Jefferson on p231 is slightly misleading: the lecture transcripts were those of Sacks. Jefferson developed her transcription conventions as part of her work with him on conversation analysis.]

Bogen, D. (1999) *Order Without Rules: Critical theory and the logic of conversation*, Albany NY, State University of New York Press. Chapter 4.

Provides a critique of the uses of transcription within conversation analysis, from an ethnomethodological point of view. It is suggested that transcripts function as rhetorical devices in the context of a foundational form of inquiry. See also Lynch, M. (1993) *Scientific Practice and Ordinary Action*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. Chapter 6.

Bucholtz, Mary (2000) 'The politics of transcription', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, pp1439-1465.

This article emphasises and illustrates some of the decisions involved in transcription within discourse analysis. It is argued that these are often based on interpretive or theoretical assumptions and may have political consequences. The author examines the latter in the context of examples from the use of a transcript in a legal trial and from a newspaper report. She focuses particularly on the issue of whether people's speech should be transcribed in terms of standard orthography, non-standard orthography designed to capture something of the way they speak, or phonetic transcription using the International Phonetic Alphabet. She emphasises that there is no single right answer to this question, and argues that what is most important is that researchers are reflexive about transcription issues, seeking to make the best decisions in the circumstances, in terms of political and ethical as well as methodological considerations, and that they make their decisions and the reasons for them explicit.

Bucholtz, M. (2007) 'Variation in transcription', *Discourse Studies*, 9, 6, pp784-808.

Rather than treating inconsistencies in the transcripts that researchers use as a problem, the author treats them as analogous to linguistic variation. She argues for more reflexive attention on the part of researchers to the decisions they make in the course of transcription. Illustrations are provided of some of kinds of variability in transcripts and their implications. She argues that 'transcribing for content' rather than for discourse structure is not inherently wrong, but she cites an example from her own work that illustrates how attention to discourse might change interpretation of the 'content' of what was said. She also examines some published re-transcriptions of previously published data, and variation in translations. [There are several responses to this article in the same issue of the journal, plus a reply from Bucholtz.]

Burke, H., Jenkins, L., and Higham, V. (2010) 'Transcribing your own data', *Realities Toolkit No.8*, Available at (accessed 9.6.10):

<http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/realities/resources/toolkits/transcribing-your-data/08-toolkit-transcribing-your-qual-data.pdf>

Cameron, D. (2001) *Working with Spoken Discourse*, London, Sage, Chapter 3.

Cook, G. (1990) 'Transcribing infinity: problems of context presentation', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, pp1-24.

This paper is concerned with the problem that while pragmatic approaches to the understanding of discourse emphasise the significance of extralinguistic context, that context is infinite in both extent and detail. Context here includes: paralinguistic features (facial expressions, gesture, bodily movement); co-text - 'text judged to belong to the same discourse, which preceded or is believed to have preceded, follows or is expected to follow, that under analysis'; intertext – 'texts which the participants associate with the text under consideration'; and thought - 'the intentions and interpretations, knowledge and beliefs, beliefs about beliefs and knowledge about knowledge (and so on, and on!) of the participants, as well as their interpersonal attitudes, affiliations and feelings' (p3). Of course, discourse types can vary in the range of what is relevant, with telephone conversations and ritual exchanges being limit cases. Cook points out that the various transcription systems put forward for discourse pragmatics have tended to neglect the problems of how context is to be selected, and have given the impression that it is possible to provide objective transcripts that include everything that is relevant. Moreover, this leads to a practical problem: that the transcripts presented by one analyst are not usable by others who have different theoretical orientations because they do not include information that is regarded as essential by the latter. These transcripts cannot, therefore, play the role that data are supposed to play in science, providing the shared empirical ground on which competing theoretical accounts can be assessed. Moreover, the more contextual information is provided, the more cumbersome the transcription becomes. There is also a problem that transcription of text and context can vary considerably in objectivity. The author argues that a distinction should be drawn between relatively objective phonetic transcription and more observer-dependent descriptions of selected context. Indeed, he argues that 'the subjective, selective and fundamentally unscientific nature of analyses of language in context should be acknowledged [...]' (p15). In the remainder of the paper he addresses the issue of what contextual information is required to analyse particular texts and how this could be provided in a practical way. He writes 'the actual potentially pragmatically relevant context of any discourse is in fact the whole universe. A selection must be made. Formal transcription systems bind transcribers to rendering only and always certain features, whether they are relevant or not. What is needed is a transcription that can select and move between one context and another' (p18). He illustrates what this might involve through examples, including an extract from Chandler's novel *The Big Sleep*.

Du Bois, John W., Susanna Cumming, Stephan Schuetze-Coburn, & Danae Paolino, (eds.) (1992) *Discourse transcription*. Santa Barbara Papers in Linguistics 4: University of California, Santa Barbara, Department of Linguistics.

Duranti, A. (1997) 'Transcription: from writing to digitized images', in *Linguistic anthropology*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Duranti, A. (2006) 'Transcripts, like shadows on a wall', *Mind, Culture and Activity*, 13, 4, pp301-10.

Duranti argues that like the shadows on the wall in Plato's parable of the cave, the selectiveness of transcripts is a virtue, it enables us to recognise important features of the social interaction they represent. He identifies two dangers that can arise from a neglect of the selectivity of transcripts: virtual-realism (treating transcripts as reality) and hypercontextualism (rejecting transcripts because they amount to mediated contact with reality as against supposed direct experience).

Edwards, J. (1992) 'Transcription of discourse', in W. Bright (ed.) *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, New York, Oxford University Press.

Edwards, J. A. (2003) 'The Transcription of Discourse', in Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D., and Hamilton, H. E. (eds.) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford, Blackwell.

Edwards, J. and Lampert, M. D. (eds.) (1993) *Talking Data: Transcription and coding in discourse research*, Hillsdale NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum.

A collection of articles by multiple authors dealing with various aspects of transcription, primarily in relation to discourse analysis within linguistics.

Ferber, Rosa (1991) 'Slip of the tongue or slip of the ear? On the perception and transcription of naturalistic slips of the tongue', *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 20, 2, pp105-122.

Fine, Elizabeth (1983) 'In defense of literary dialect: A response to Dennis R. Preston', *Journal of American Folklore*, 96, 381, pp323-330.

Flewitt, Rosie (2006) 'Using video to investigate preschool classroom interaction: Education research assumptions and methodological practices', *Visual Communication*, 5, 1, pp25-50.

Glesne, C. (1997) 'That rare feeling: re-presenting research through poetic transcription', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 3, 2, pp202-21.

This is an argument for and exemplification of what the author refers to as 'poetic transcription', which she describes as 'the creation of poemlike compositions from the words of interviewees' (p202). In fact, what this seems to involve is 'the transformation of interview transcripts [already produced by a transcriber] into poetry' (p205), so that in this sense it is more a form of analysis and research writing than of transcription per se. (See also the reference to Crapanzano's work in Atkinson 1992.) The rules of the transformation of transcriptions into poems Glesne adopted were that the words must be those of the interviewee but that phrases could be taken from anywhere in the transcript and juxtaposed while keeping 'enough of her words together to re-present her speaking rhythm, her way of saying things'. Moreover, this creative transformation was preceded by the kind of coding of the data and identification of themes that is common in much qualitative

research. The aim was to identify 'the essence of what she was saying' and then to present it in poetic form, but also 'to convey the emotions that the interviews evoked in [the researcher]'. The author provides five poetic transcriptions, based on interviews with the same informant, along with commentaries about her life. The author claims that 'poetic transcription creates a third voice that is neither the interviewee's nor the researcher's but is a combination of both' (p215).

Goodwin, C. (1994) 'Professional vision', *American Anthropologist*, 96, 3, pp606-33.

Gregory, D., Russell, C. K., and Phillips, L. R. (1997) 'Beyond textual perfection: transcribers as vulnerable persons', *Qualitative Health Research*, 7, 2, pp294-300.

This article takes a novel perspective on transcription, recognising that researchers often rely on transcribers (often women) who had no direct role in the data collection and will not participate in the analysis. As a result, they tend to be treated as 'faceless technicians' when they ought to be treated as 'persons' (p294). As part of the process, transcribers are 'privileged to the full range of human emotions', for example in reading about 'disease trajectories and the hardships of life' and this can have 'a profound impact on the transcriber' (p295). The authors argue that this means that they may require protection via ethical regulation of research. The issue is briefly illustrated from research on suffering among cancer patients.

Green, J., Franquiz, M., and Dixon, C. (1997) 'The myth of the objective transcript: Transcribing as a situated art', *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 1, pp172-6.

The idea that transcription can involve writing talk down 'in an objective way' is rejected in favour of seeing it as a 'situated act within a study or program of research embedded in a conceptual ecology of a discipline', and therefore as 'a political act that reflects a discipline's conventions as well as a researcher's conceptualization of a phenomenon, purposes for the research, theories guiding the data collection and analysis, and programmatic goals' (p172).

Griffin, C. (2007) 'Being dead and being there: Research interviews, sharing hand cream and the preference for analysing "naturally occurring data"', *Discourse Studies*, 9, pp246-269. (See responses by Potter and Hepburn and Henwood, and the reply by Griffin in the same issue.)

This article, and the responses to it, are not directly about transcription, but they relate to an issue – the analytic usefulness of interview data versus 'naturally occurring talk' - in which the issue of what sort of transcription is appropriate arises. See also Potter and Hepburn 2005.

ten Have, P. (2002) 'Reflections on transcription', *Cahiers de Praxématique*, 39, pp21-43. Available at (accessed 27.08.08):
<http://www.paultenhave.nl/Transcription-rv2.pdf>

Outlines some of the issues involved in transcription for the purposes of con-

versation analysis, and addresses the critiques of Bogen and Ashmore.

Hepburn, A. (2004) 'Crying: Notes on Description, Transcription, and Interaction', *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 37, pp251-91.

This is an exploration of how crying can and should be represented in transcripts for the purposes of conversation analysis. It parallels the discussion of representing laughter by Jefferson 1985. Hepburn compares different transcripts, and tries to show the importance of detailed transcriptions that seek to represent the sounds of crying, using as data calls to the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. She examines various features associated with crying, including whispering, sniffing, wobbly voice, and so on.

Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R. (1998) *Conversation Analysis: Principles, practices, and applications*, Cambridge, Polity, chapter on Data and Transcription Techniques, pp73-92.

Jefferson, G. (1983) *Issues in the transcription of naturally-occurring talk: Caricature vs. capturing pronunciation particulars*, Tilburg Papers in Language and Literature 34, Tilburg University.

Jefferson, G. (1985) 'An exercise in the transcription and analysis of laughter', in van Dijk, T. A. (ed.) *Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Vol. 3*, London, Academic Press.

Jefferson, G. (1989) 'Preliminary notes on a possible metric which provides for a "standard maximum" silence of approximately one second in conversation', in Roger, D. and Bull, P. (eds.) *Conversation: An interdisciplinary perspective*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.

Jefferson, G. (1996) 'A case of transcriptional stereotyping', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, pp159-170.

Jefferson, G. (2004) 'Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction', in Lerner, G. H. (ed.) *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation*, Amsterdam, Benjamins.

A recent account of Jefferson's transcription system for conversation analysis.

Journal of Sociolinguistics 4, 4, 2000. Special issue on Non-standard orthography and non-standard speech.

Kelly, J. and Local, J. K. (1989) 'On the use of general phonetic techniques in handling conversational material', in Roger, D. and Bull, P. (eds.) *Conversation: An interdisciplinary perspective*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.

Kerswill, P. and Wright, S. (1990) 'The validity of phonetic transcription: limitations of a sociolinguistic research tool', *Language Variation and Change*, 2, 3, pp255-75.

Kitzinger, C. (1998) 'Inaccuracies in quoting from data transcripts: or inaccuracy in

quotations from data transcripts', *Discourse and Society*, 9, pp136-43.

Kvale, S. (1996) *InterViews*, Thousand oaks CA, Sage, chapter 9.

Introduces audio-recording plus transcription as the main method used for recording interview data today, though emphasises the contextual information that is lost through reliance on these sources, and the danger of treating the transcript as the data - as capturing reality. The author emphasises the constructive character of transcription, in the sense of the decisions that are involved, and recommends reliability checks to identify and correct errors. At the same time, he argues that there is no such thing as a single correct transcription, and notes the difference between oral and written language forms. He draws on Mishler's work to argue the value of poetic transcriptions that are designed to capture oral style, where this differs significantly from written forms. He presents transcripts as tools, analogous to maps in needing to be tailored to purpose.

Lapadat, J. C. (2000) 'Problematizing transcription: purpose, paradigm and quality', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 3, 3, pp203-19.

This article outlines the decisions involved in transcription and how different decisions are appropriate depending upon the nature of the data and the purposes of the analysis. It provides a brief history of the emergence of attention to transcription issues, and discusses the assumptions built into transcription and how the nature of the transcript can affect the course of the analysis. The author claims that transcription 'is a constructive and interpretive act in which the researcher positions him/herself' (p209). The article ends with a consideration of transcript quality from a constructivist and interpretive point of view. As part of this, the training of transcribers is discussed.

Lapadat, J. C. and Lindsay, A. C. (1999) 'Transcription in research and practice: from standardization of technique to interpretive positionings', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 5, 1, pp64-86.

Reviews the (by 1999) extensive literature on transcription, focusing on those writers who have sought to put forward a standard set of conventions and those who have recognised the unavoidability of a plurality of conventions. The fundamental argument is that transcription necessarily relies upon theoretical interpretation, and that what it produces cannot therefore be objective, this term being taken to mean 'reflecting reality'. There is also a discussion of transcription in research on professional practice, where the approach adopted is often pragmatic, including for example the coding of recordings 'live' without the use of transcription.

Lomax, H. and Casey, N. (1998) 'Recording social life: reflexivity and video methodology', *Sociological Research Online*, 3, 2, available at: <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/3/2/1.html>

Luebs, M. A. (1996) *Frozen speech: The rhetoric of transcription*, unpublished Ph.D.

dissertation, University of Michigan.

Macaulay, R. K. S. (1991) “‘Coz it izny spelt when they say it’: Displaying dialect in writing’, *American Speech*, 66, 3, pp280-291.

Macbeth, D. (1999) ‘Glances, trances and their relevance for a visual sociology’, in Jalbert, P. (ed.) *Media Studies: Ethnomethodological approaches*, Washington DC, University Press of America.

MacLean, L. M., Mechthild M. and Estable, M. (2004) ‘Improving accuracy of transcripts in qualitative research’, *Qualitative Health Research*, 14, 1, pp113-123.

Miethaner, U. (2000) ‘Orthographic transcriptions of non-standard varieties: The case of Earlier African-American English’, *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4, 4, pp534-560.

Mishler, E. G. (1991) ‘Representing discourse: the rhetoric of transcription’, *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 1, 4, pp225-80.

An early, very influential article still of value. It approaches transcription as an instance of the general problem of representing reality, as it arises in photography and in the biological and natural sciences. There is comparison of alternative transcriptions of the same stretches of talk. The focus is on the role of theoretical assumptions and the rhetorical functions performed by transcript data. Transcription is presented as an interpretive practice, against the background of ‘the essential indeterminacy and ambiguity of the relationship between language and meaning’ (abstract). Mishler begins by raising issues about the nature of representation via the example of photography, noting how it depends upon social conventions about reality, that it can generate very different images of ‘the same’ scene, and that our interpretations of photographs depend upon attributions of context. All representation must be seen as a ‘thoroughly cultural formation’, rather than from the perspective of naïve realism. He draws a parallel between the ‘technical’ attitude adopted by some researchers towards transcription and the naïve view of photographs as simply re-presenting reality as it was. It is against this background that he compares transcripts, looking at what they include and exclude, how this reflects the theoretical purposes of the authors, and how the transcripts are shaped to particular rhetorical functions. He also illustrates the dangers of building as single set of theoretical assumptions into the transcription process.

Mondada, L. (2007) ‘Commentary: transcript variations and the indexicality of transcribing practices’, *Discourse Studies*, 9, 6, pp809-21.

This is a response to Bucholz 2007, though in effect it is an independent article. The author argues that transcription is an interpretive, situated practice, and that as a result there will always be scope for producing different transcripts of the same piece of interaction. She argues that transcripts cannot serve as ‘immutable mobiles’, in Latour’s sense of the term, but rather amount to what Star and Griesemer refer to as ‘boundary objects’, in that different properties and meanings are attributed to ‘the same’

transcript in the context of different analytic practices. The author claims that analytical practices, including transcription, ‘configure and more radically “fabricate” what we consider as “data”’ (p810), and also notes the interdependence of transcript and recording. The main focus of the article is the use of ‘alignment tools like CLAN, Transana., or Elan, which allow transcribers to link primary and secondary data’ (p811). Despite recognition that transcription is ‘a deeply interpretive activity’, Mondada argues that recordings and transcripts preserve the data and allow the analyst to come back to it repeatedly (p811). In the second half of the article she illustrates some of the decisions involved in representing multi-modal data, and how different software produces variable representations. She focuses in particular on the way in which different alignment programs represent the timing of video- recorded actions, and the analytical significance of this.

Norris, S. (2002) ‘The implication of visual research for discourse analysis: Transcription beyond language’, *Visual Communication*, 1, 1, pp97-121.

Norris, S. (2004) *Analyzing Multimodal Interaction: A methodological framework*, New York, Routledge.

O’Connell, D. C. and Kowal, S. (1990) ‘Some sources of error in the transcription of real time in spoken discourse’, *Georgetown Journal of Languages and Linguistics*, 1, 4, pp453-466.

O’Connell, D. C. and Kowal, S. (1994) ‘Some current transcription systems for spoken discourse: a critical analysis’, *Pragmatics*, 4, pp81–107

O’Connell, D. C. and Kowal, S. (1999) ‘Transcription and the issue of standardization’, *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 28, pp103-120.

O’Connell, D. C. and Kowal, S. (2000) ‘Are transcripts reproducible?’, *Pragmatics*, 10, 2, pp247-269.

Ochs, E. (1979) ‘Transcription as theory’, in Ochs, E. and Schieffelin, B. (eds.) *Developmental Pragmatics*, New York: Academic Press. 43-72.

One of the earliest discussions of the issues involved in transcription, pointing out that it always involves theoretical assumptions and that different forms of transcript may be suitable for different purposes. Still useful.

Oller, D. K. and Eilers, R. E. (1975) ‘Phonetic expectation and transcription validity’, *Phonetica* 31, 3-4, pp288-304.

Patterson, B. R., Neupauer, N. C., Burant, P. A., Koehn, S. C. and Reed, A. T. (1996) ‘A preliminary examination of conversation analytic techniques: Rates of inter-transcriber reliability’, *Western Journal of Communication*, 60, 1, pp76-91.

Peräkylä, A. (1997/2003) Validity and reliability in research based on tapes and transcripts. In Silverman, D. (ed) *Qualitative Analysis: Issues of Theory and Method*. London: Sage, pp. 201-220. Revised edition 2003. Reprinted in Seale, C. (ed.) *Social*

Research Methods. A Reader. London: Routledge. 2003.

The revised version of this chapter involves updating of references, a new section on quantification, plus a few other small insertions and deletions. The overall argument is the same. Peräkylä suggests that CA is more effective in dealing with issues of reliability and validity than some other kinds of qualitative research, in particular because the data can be made available to readers. He argues that reliability can be enhanced through recording relatively large corpuses of talk, attending to the quality of the recording, and ensuring the adequacy of the transcripts. Furthermore, there are measures that can be taken to deal with the danger that any particular interactional event needs to be seen in the context of a longer sequence of events, relevant non-verbal behaviour, and the use of documents by participants. In other words, means can be used for 'securing maximum inclusiveness of the recorded data'. As regards validity, Peräkylä argues that conversation analytic claims are often transparent, in that they have 'apparent validity': readers can easily recognise the validity of the analysis. There are also two additional strategies that conversation analysts use to enhance validity: relying on 'validation through "next turn"', in other words relying on participants' displayed recognition of the character of previous actions; and the analysis of deviant cases. The author also addresses the issue of the generalisability of the knowledge claims produced by conversation analysts and, in the revised version, the potential role of quantification.

Poland, B. D. (1995) 'Transcription quality as an aspect of rigor in qualitative research', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 1, 3, pp290-310.

Emphasises the importance of seeking to ensure the quality of transcriptions in qualitative research, noting that this seems to be given less attention than it deserves. The author explores the notion of verbatim accounts, noting that audio-recordings do not include all the data that might be relevant to analysing interview material. Threats to validity are identified and strategies for avoiding or remedying them outlined. The focus is on relatively uncontroversial sorts of error in the context of a large project which employed transcribers as ancillary workers.

Poland, B. (2002) 'Transcription quality' in Gubrium, J.F. and Holstein, J.A. (eds) *Handbook of Interview Research*, Thousand Oaks, Sage. Reprinted in Holstein, J.A. and Gubrium, J.F. (eds) (2003) *Inside Interviewing: New Lenses, New Concerns*, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

Potter, J. & Hepburn, A. (2005) 'Qualitative interviews in psychology: problems and possibilities', *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 2, 281-307. (see responses by Smith, Hollway, and Mishler, and the reply from Potter and Hepburn in the same issue).

As with Griffin 2007 and the responses to that, this exchange was not directly concerned with transcription, but it relates to an issue where the question of what sort of transcription is appropriate arises.

Powers, W. R. (2005) *Transcription Techniques for the Spoken Word*, Lanham MD, Altamira Press.

Preston, D. (1982) 'Ritin folklower daun "rong"', *Journal of American Folklore*, 95, pp304-26.

This and subsequent publications by Preston listed below are about the issue of whether to use non-standard spellings or phonetic transcription to represent pronunciation.

Preston, D. (1983) "'Mowr bayud spellin': A reply to Fine', *Journal of American Folklore*, 96, 381, pp330-339.

Preston, D. (1985) 'The Li'l Abner syndrome: written representations of speech', *American Speech*, 60, pp328-36.

Preston, D. R. (2000) "'Mowr and mowr bayud spellin': Confessions of a sociolinguist', *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4, 4, pp614-621.

Psathas, G. and Anderson, T. (1990) 'The "practices" of transcription in conversation analysis', *Semiotica*, 78, 1/2, pp75-99.

Outlines what is involved in transcription for the purposes of conversation analysis, and the rationale for this.

Pye, C., Wilcox, K. A., and Siren, K. A. (1988) 'Refining transcriptions: The significance of transcriber "errors"', *Journal of Child Language*, 15, 1, pp17-37.

Roberts, C. (1997) 'Transcribing talk: issues of representation', *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 1, pp167-72.

Argues that there is a politics of transcription, that the practice needs to be located in the context of 'language ideology [as] a mediating link between social structures and forms of talk' (p167). Thus, 'as transcribers fix the fleeting moment of words as marks on the page, they call up the social roles and relations constituted in language and rely on their own social evaluations of speech in deciding how to write it' (pp167-8). The author argues that 'the challenge for the transcriber is to produce transcriptions that are accurate and readable but that are also reflexive in how they make explicit to the reader the constructed nature of written talk and so the problematic nature of accuracy and readability' (p168). The issue of whose voice is being represented in transcriptions, and the dangers of stigmatisation are also addressed.

Roberts, F. and Robinson, J. D. (2004) 'Interobserver agreement on first-stage conversation analytic transcription', *Human Communication Research*, 30, 3, pp376-410.

Romero, C., O'Connell, D. C., and Kowal, S. (2002) 'Notation systems for transcription: An empirical investigation', *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 31, 6, pp619-631.

Ross, J. (2010) 'Was that infinity or affinity? Applying insights from translation studies to qualitative research transcription', *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 11, 2, Art, 2, <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs100223>

Sacks, H. (1984) 'Notes on methodology', in Atkinson, J. M. and Heritage, J. (eds.) *Structures of Social Action*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Sherzer, J. (1994) 'Transcription, representation, and translation: Repetition and performance in Kuna discourse', in Johnstone, B. (ed.) *Repetition in discourse: Interdisciplinary perspectives. Vol. 1*, Norwood NJ, Ablex.

Slembrouck, S. (2007) 'Transcription - the extended directions of data histories: a response to M. Bucholtz's "Variation in transcription"', *Discourse Studies*, 9, 6, pp822-7.

Spinos, A-M. R., O'Connell, D. C. and Kowal, S. (2002) 'An empirical investigation of pauses notation', *Pragmatics*, 12, 1, pp1-9.

Swann, J. (2001) 'Recording and transcribing talk in educational settings' in Candlin, C. and Mercer, N. (eds) *English Language Teaching in its Social Context*, London, Routledge.

Provides practical guidance about recording and transcribing talk.

Tilley, S. A. (2003a) "'Challenging" research practices: turning a critical lens on the work of transcription', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 9, 5, pp750-73.

This paper examines the role of transcribers employed to produce transcription for research purposes. She argues that the interpretations of the transcriber will shape the data, and emphasises the need to pay attention to this. She explores the experiences of someone hired to transcribe audio-recordings of focus group interviews, the problems he faced and his use of voice-recognition software.

Tilley, S. A. (2003b) 'Transcription work: learning through coparticipation in research practices', *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16, 6, pp835-51.

Recounts the experience of working with a transcriber, over a period of 2 years, reflecting on the insights gained through collaboration involved in producing a transcript. The data were generated by informal interviews with the transcriber, and by asking her to keep a journal during the transcription process. The process highlighted some of the complexities of the transcription process, in the context of a 'critical feminist ethnography' of women in prison.

Urban, G. (1996) 'Entextualization, replication, and power', in Silverstein M. and Urban, G. (eds.) *Natural Histories of Discourse*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Van Borsel, J. J. (1989) 'The reliability of phonetic transcription: A practical note', *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 5, 3, pp327-333.

Vigouroux, C. B. (2007) 'Trans-scription as a social activity: an ethnographic approach', *Ethnography*, 8, 1, pp61-97.

This reports an ethnographic study of a linguistic anthropologist working with two consultants in order to produce a transcript of data concerned with language socialisation in Paris. The anthropologist and her two 'consultants' were all participants in the family dinner whose talk is being transcribed. A further complication is that while the language being transcribed is French, and the discussion between the anthropologist and her consultants is in French, the analysis was to be carried out in English. A particular focus in the article is on a dispute that arose in the transcription process, examined via a form of discourse analysis that is attentive not only to the talk but also to physical positioning of the participants and the socio-cultural aspects of their interaction. What is involved here is analysis of a transcript of a video-recording of the collaborative transcription of a video-recording of a dinner party! As is illustrated, one of the implications of engaging participants in the transcription process is that, on occasion, they will claim authority as to what they said or meant, and this may lead to conflict.

West, C. (1996) 'Ethnography and orthography: a (modest) methodological proposal', *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 25, 3, pp327-52.

West starts from Moerman's call for a combining of ethnography with conversation analysis. Her focus is on the value of CA transcription practices for ethnographic work. For example, she identifies dangers involved in the normalisation of talk in transcripts: the representation of speech in standard orthography, as against the use of representational means that capture how it was uttered. There is also a discussion of what she calls transcription without recording: how, in some contexts such as law trials, ethnographers have managed to transcribe talk 'live'. In this respect, and others, she also takes account of the limitations of a CA approach for ethnographic purposes.

Wootton, A. J. (1989) 'Remarks on the methodology of conversation analysis', in Roger, D. and Bull, P. (eds.) *Conversation: an interdisciplinary perspective*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.

For various web-sites that include material about transcription, see:

<http://linguistics.ucsb.edu/projects/transcription/representing>

<http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/schegloff/TranscriptionProject/index.html>

<http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/projects/transcription/index.html>

<http://www-staff.lboro.ac.uk/~ssjap/transcription/transcription.htm>

<http://www-student.lut.ac.uk/~ssah2/transcription/transcription.htm>